

PARENTS & ADOLESCENTS RECOVERING TOGETHER SUCCESSFULLY,
San Diego, June, 19, 1999.

Rep. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,
Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR DUKE: Parents and Adolescents Recovering Together Successfully (PARTS) is a non-profit organization dedicated to reducing the number of child addicts and believes that proactive prevention and intervention within the family is the best solution for fighting the devastating long-term effects of teenage substance abuse. Much of what we teach is based on federal medical research.

We wish to support your goal of doubling our federal medical research investment over the next five years as recommended by H. Res. 89. The National Institutes of Health, and specifically NIDA provide valuable medical research to us and impact many of our families.

My Best,

ALAN SORKIN,
Executive Director.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
 SAN DIEGO,
LaJolla, CA, June 21, 1999.

Hon. DUKE CUNNINGHAM,
*U.S. House of Representatives,
 Washington, DC*

DEAR REP. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you for taking the time to highlight the important benefits to patients of the research funded through NIH and other agencies. I believe our gene therapy research outlines the value of that funding.

Recent developments in molecular medicine have made possible the use of gene therapy as a weapon in the fight against cancer. Here at UCSD, we have been able to genetically modify human leukemia cells in a way that induces a powerful, killing response from the immune system. In laboratory experiments, we found that the immune response prompted by the modified cells destroyed active leukemia cells lurking nearby. When we moved from the laboratory to Phase I clinical trials, we focused on patients who have chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL), a currently incurable condition afflicting more than 50,000 people per year in the United States.

The Phase I results were very encouraging. Eleven patients were each treated with a single injection of their own modified leukemia cells, and all but one had a significant drop in the number of leukemia cells found in their blood, and a reduction in the size of their lymph nodes. This was the first time that a response this dramatic had been seen in the history of treating this disease with a single treatment. A San Diego Union-Tribune article describing the first phase research—and highlighting some of the ways that breakthroughs in medical research literally shape the lives and futures of our patients—is attached.

We are now working on the larger, Phase II study that will involve multiple injections over time. Although this study has not yet begun, we have already been contacted by about 200 people from around the world seeking to serve as volunteers.

Thanks again for all the help and support of you and your Congressional colleagues for supporting increased medical research funding. These dollars make possible the cutting edge medical research we hope will some day lead to cures of terrible diseases like CLL.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. KIPPS, M.D., PH.D.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL BARNES MOODY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order

of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend and great American, Mr. Samuel Barnes Moody. Sam Moody, who was my very special friend and was very special to me personally, was born on June 2, 1920.

Last week, Sam Moody passed away in central Florida. I first met Sam Moody in my civic activities in central Florida some years ago. However, I never really knew much about his background until some years ago when I invited Sam and several other veteran leaders to a small luncheon gathering.

As we sat together, I asked each of the veterans to relate some of their military service recollections after lunch to our group. Sam Moody started off rather hesitantly but he began telling an incredible story.

Let me say a little bit about Sam Moody. He joined the old Army Air Corps on November 15, 1940. After his basic training, he was shipped out to Manila in the Philippines where he arrived on Thursday Thanksgiving Day, 1941. Some 18 days later, World War II broke out. Sam Moody and his group found themselves on Bataan and eventually they ran out of food and supplies in April of 1942.

Sam went on to tell the story that on April 9, 1942, he and more than a thousand others took part in the famous Bataan Death March. Over 10,000 men, women and children died. Somehow God spared Sam Moody.

He was then cast on a ship, a transport. This story is relayed in his autobiography from this event entitled *Reprieve From Hell*, and I strongly recommend that to every American, particularly every young American. In this transport, hundreds of other Americans were crammed into the hull of a ship that was torpedoed by an American submarine. Many, many, many died. Somehow Sam survived. God spared Sam Moody.

Also as a prisoner of war, Sam Moody served under incredible conditions when he arrived in Japan, under torturous and malnutrition conditions, along with hundreds and hundreds of others. Of 36,000 American servicemen, less than 10 percent survived, but somehow God spared Sam Moody.

In 1946, after his release and return home, Sam Moody went back to Japan to testify for the American government at the International War Crimes trial. Sam was probably the only enlisted survivor to testify in these trials to help bring justice to those who had killed and tortured so many.

At these trials, Sam Moody met Madeline, who was working for General MacArthur. They married and have two wonderful children, Betty and Steve.

Sergeant Sam Moody leaves behind a wonderful family, to whom I extend my very deepest sympathy. Sergeant Sam

Moody also leaves behind a record of incredible service and devotion to our Nation and a country he dearly loved.

Sam Moody also leaves behind an incredible record of his service and survival from World War II and the Bataan Death March, which I recommend again to every Member of Congress and every American. It is called *Reprieve From Hell*.

□ 1745

Sam Moody went to be with his Maker last week. We will miss him.

THE NECESSITY OF THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL STATUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), who is from my committee, for allowing me to interrupt his one hour special order.

Mr. Speaker, today the Independent Counsel statute expires. There has been a real heralding by many people in the legal community for the demise of this law. I would like to tonight talk just a little bit about that law and why something like it is absolutely necessary.

For the past 3 years my committee has been investigating illegal campaign contributions. We are now involved in investigating espionage and lack of security at our nuclear laboratories, and the possibility that these things had something in common.

One of the biggest problems that we have had has been a reluctance by the Justice Department, under Janet Reno, to cooperate with our committee. It has been extremely difficult to get the Justice Department to work with us to get to the bottom of these scandals.

If we have an administration that has broken the law, if we have an administration or people in an administration who have become corrupt, and we have an Attorney General who is appointed by the President who is blocking for the administration, how do we administer justice? How do we get to the bottom of illegal activities, if we have an administration that has broken the law and a Justice Department that is controlled by the administration who will not bring those who broke the law to justice?

I think that that is what we have today. We have had a number of people that have taken the Fifth Amendment. Our committee has faced over 121 people who have taken the Fifth Amendment or fled the country in the campaign finance scandal, 121 people. That is unparalleled in American history.

We have asked the Justice Department and Janet Reno time and time and time again to work with us to bring these people before the committee to explain to the American people why Communist China, Macao, Egypt, Taiwan, South American countries, have been giving campaign contributions to the Democrat National

Committee and the President's reelection committee, and we have gotten absolutely no cooperation from the Justice Department.

In fact, if Members look at the administration and the Justice Department, we will find they have, in effect, erected a stone wall between what happened and the American people. How do we break through that stone wall? What mechanism do we use to bring people to justice who broke the law, who may have even endangered America's national security?

The only way we can do that is to have somebody outside the system investigate and prosecute those people who have broken the law. Unfortunately, now that we no longer have an Independent Counsel statute, we have no mechanism with which to do that.

Maybe the Independent Counsel statute was flawed, maybe there were some problems with it, but it should have been perfected, in my opinion, so there was a mechanism to investigate people in an administration that might be corrupt without going through the person that they appoint to be the Attorney General who might be blocking for them, as I believe has been the case with this Attorney General and this Justice Department.

So tonight I am one of those voices, I am sure, that is crying in the wilderness, because I believe we need something like an Independent Counsel statute to ensure that justice will be done in this country.

Right now, now that the Independent Counsel statute has expired, if we have a president now or in the future who breaks the law or if we have people in his administration who break the law, and the President has appointed an Attorney General who is willing to block for him and keep the facts from coming out where there might have been corruption, then there is nothing that can be done for the American people to count on to bring these people to justice.

So I would just like to say that although the Independent Counsel statute may have had some flaws, we should not have junked the whole thing, we should have found an alternative. I am sorry that we did not.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN AMERICA, AND INEQUITIES IN THE NATION'S MONETARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. This evening I hope to touch on some issues that are not often discussed here on the floor of the House, and along with me I am happy to welcome the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

I want to begin by touching on an issue that I believe is perhaps the most important issue facing this country. It

is not talked about enough, but it is something that all of us should be deeply concerned about. That is, Mr. Speaker, in the last election, 36 percent of the American people voted. That means almost two-thirds of the American people did not believe it was important enough for their future to come out and vote.

What is even more alarming is that among people 24 years of age or younger, we had, if Members can believe it, 18 percent of those people voting. Eighty-two percent said they were not interested in voting. That is frightening unto itself, but it bodes very poorly for the future because there is very good evidence that if young people do not vote, it is much less likely that they will vote in the future.

So what happened in recent elections is that fewer and fewer people are participating. The vast majority of low-income people do not vote. Most working people do not vote. But then, on the other hand, we have upper income people who do vote, and upper income people who contribute heavily to both political parties and into the political process. So the voices of working people and low-income people are virtually not heard in this institution. Their needs are not taken account of as legislation is dealt with.

But for those folks who have the money, the wealthiest one-quarter of 1 percent who make 80 percent of the campaign contributions, Congress continuously does their bidding, pays attention to their needs. I think we have a vicious circle, that as Congress pays more and more attention to the needs of the wealthy and not to working people, not to the middle class, then the vast majority of the people turn off even further from the political process and say, hey, this Congress does not represent me. Why should I vote?

Tonight I want to touch on a number of issues. But before we get going, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, following on that point, the question really is, for whose benefit is the country run and the economy run?

If we ask, and I have asked, groups of students in my district, now, who do you think has the most impact on the economy in the United States in government, most people would guess the President. Some talk about the Secretary of the Treasury. A few guessed the Congress, the House and Senate. But virtually none say, well, Congressman, I know who it is, it is the Federal Reserve. It is that appointed, unelected, group of extraordinarily wealthy individuals, for the most part, who meet in secret.

Today they met in secret downtown in Washington, D.C., in their marble palace, sitting at their exotic long boardroom table, marble, with nice exotic hardwoods, and they made a decision that I suppose does not sound that important to most people, but the impact will be tremendous.

Again, it goes essentially to who really runs this country. They decided to raise interest rates by one-quarter of 1 percent. That does not sound like a lot, except there are tens of millions of Americans who tomorrow will wake up to find that their mortgage rate went up, their credit card rate went up, their adjustable car loan went up.

In fact, it is computed that that one-quarter of 1 percent increase will cost a family money. Here is a family that has a \$100,000 mortgage, a \$15,000 4-year car loan, and \$2,000 on a credit card. It sounds pretty middle class to me. It will cost them \$6,913 for the mortgage, \$84 on the car loan, and \$16 on the credit card; \$7,013, that one-quarter of 1 percent rate.

I suppose that would be justified if there was a reason to do it. What is the reason? Are we worried about inflation, which is at or near historic lows? I do not think so. It might be that the Fed is worried about higher wages. The gentleman and I have talked about that previously. Sometimes the Federal Reserve gets worried when the unemployment rate drops below 5 or 6 percent.

They had a rule for years saying it should not go below 6 percent. Then they said maybe 5 percent. They get worried, because what happens if unemployment drops?

Mr. SANDERS. What will happen is then, horror of all horror, wages may go up. Let me just touch on that very important point.

We hear every day on the television, we hear it on the radio, we read it in the newspapers, that we are living in the midst of one of the great economic booms in our history. Maybe that fear that with low unemployment wages might go up has in fact prompted the Federal Reserve to do what it did today.

But I want to, for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, give a chart which very clearly belies this nonsense that there is an economic boom for the middle class or for working people.

According to information assembled by the Economic Policy Institute, and I do not think there is a lot of debate about this, in 1973 the weekly earnings, the real average weekly earnings of workers in the United States, was \$502, okay? In 1973, the weekly earnings, average earnings, were \$502.

In 1998, in the midst of a great economic boom, the weekly earnings were \$442, a 12 percent reduction in real wages. The reality is that in order to compensate for the lowering of real wages, the average American today is working significantly more hours. People are working two jobs, people are working three jobs.

So if the Fed thinks that they have got to once again increase unemployment to dampen wage increases, I would have very strong disagreement, because in reality today the average person in the middle class is struggling. The gentleman and I have discussed it before. It is true in Oregon, it is true in Vermont.